

REMARKS

Applicants' undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for his comments. The specification has been amended as suggested by the Examiner, on page 2, line 14.

The Examiner indicated that Claims 2-9 recite allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of former Claim 2. Claim 2 has been canceled, and Claim 3 has been amended to depend from Claim 1. Claims 5-9 have been canceled.

Independent Claims 34 and 41 have been amended to recite the limitations of former Claim 2. Amended Claims 34 and 41 are narrower than amended Claim 1, and should be patentable for at least the same reasons.

New Claims 46-86 have been added. Independent Claim 46 combines the limitations of former Claim 1 and former Claim 5. Independent Claim 56 combines the limitations of former Claim 34 and former Claim 5. Independent Claim 63 combines the limitations of former Claim 41 and former Claim 5. Claims 56 and 63 are narrower than Claim 46, and should be patentable for at least the same reasons.

Independent Claim 68 combines the limitations of former Claim 1 and former Claim 9. Independent Claim 75 combines the limitations of former Claim 34 and former Claim 9. Independent Claim 82 combines the limitations of former Claim 41 and former Claim 9. Claims 75 and 82 are narrower than Claim 68, and should be patentable for at least the same reasons.

Serial No.: 09/995,962

Docket No.: KCC-16,652

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 10-13 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Haffner et al. (U.S. Patent 5,789,065). The Examiner rejected Claims 34-39 and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Haffner et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed. All of the independent claims presently in the application incorporate the limitations of previous Claim 2, 5 or 9, which the Examiner found to be allowable if written in independent form.

Claims 33, 40 and 45 have been withdrawn from consideration as directed to a nonelected invention. Claims 55, 62, 67, 74, 81 and 86 are also directed to the nonelected invention. Applicants request that all of these claims be considered with the remaining claims, because all of the independent claims recite allowable subject matter.

Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner feels that any issues remain unresolved, then Applicants' attorney requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



Maxwell J. Petersen
Registration No. 32,772

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road
Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195
TEL (847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403